

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 TIMOTHY TAYLOR,

Case No. 2:20-cv-00786-KJD-EJY

4 Plaintiff

ORDER

5 v.

6 MICHAEL KEELER et al.,

7 Defendants

8 This action began with a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983  
9 by a former state prisoner. On May 20, 2021, this Court issued an order directing Plaintiff  
10 to file his updated address with this Court by June 18, 2021. (ECF No. 3). The deadline  
11 has now expired, and Plaintiff has not filed his updated address or otherwise responded  
12 to the Court's order.

13 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and "[i]n the  
14 exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . .  
15 dismissal" of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831  
16 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party's failure  
17 to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.  
18 See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (affirming dismissal for  
19 noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir.  
20 1992) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of  
21 complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal  
22 for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of  
23 address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming  
24 dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421,  
25 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (affirming dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with  
26 local rules).

26 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey  
27 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors:  
28 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to


1 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring  
2 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.  
3 See *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at  
4 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

5 Here, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously  
6 resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket, weigh in favor of  
7 dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of  
8 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay  
9 in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air*  
10 *West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—public policy favoring  
11 disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of  
12 dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey  
13 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"  
14 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779  
15 F.2d at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file his updated address with the  
16 Court by June 18, 2021, expressly stated: "IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, if Plaintiff  
17 fails to timely comply with this Order, his case will be subject to dismissal without  
18 prejudice." (ECF No. 3 at 2). Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that dismissal would  
19 result from his noncompliance with the Court's order to file his updated address by June  
20 18, 2021.

21 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on  
22 Plaintiff's failure to file an updated address in compliance with this Court's May 20, 2021,  
23 order.

24 It is further ordered that the Clerk of Court will close the case and enter judgment  
25 accordingly.

26 DATED THIS 22 day of June 2021.



28 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE